



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/755,982	01/05/2001	Mohamed Abdel Hamid Hassanin	MSFT116572	4780

26389 7590 08/01/2003

CHRISTENSEN, O'CONNOR, JOHNSON, KINDNESS, PLLC
1420 FIFTH AVENUE
SUITE 2800
SEATTLE, WA 98101-2347

EXAMINER

NGUYEN, LE V

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2174

DATE MAILED: 08/01/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/755,982

Applicant(s)

HASSANIN ET AL.

Examiner

Le Nguyen

Art Unit

2174

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-23 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-23 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 07 May 2001 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other:

DETAILED ACTION

Drawings

1. The drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(5) because they do not include the following reference sign(s) mentioned in the description:

- a) page 6, line 27: "optical drive interface 58" of fig. 5;
- b) page 8, line 20: "monitor 61" of fig. 5; and
- c) page 8, line 20: "RAM 38" of fig. 5.

A proposed drawing correction or corrected drawings are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

2. The drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(4) because reference character "60" has been used to designate both a keyboard and an optical drive interface. A proposed drawing correction or corrected drawings are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

3. The drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(4) because:

- a) reference characters "36" and "34" have both been used to designate hard disk drive on page 6, lines 18, 25, 28 and throughout the specification; and
- b) reference character "68" described on page 7 of line 29 and reference character "67" illustrated on fig. 5 have both been used to designate "WAN".

A proposed drawing correction or corrected drawings are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Specification

4. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities:

- a) page 10, line 31: the phrase “object 106is” appears to contain a typographical error;
- b) page 14, line 20: the phrase “diagram 134of” appears to contain a typographical error;
- c) page 15, line 3: “row 140” needs to be changed to column 140, block 140 or row 148.

Appropriate correction is required; and

d) page 20, lines 10-11: the sentence “A renderer renders...while maintaining a truth table for” appears to be a sentence fragment.

5. The drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(5) because they include the following reference sign(s) not mentioned in the description:

- a) 146, 148 and 150 of fig. 4; and
- b) 69 of fig. 5.

A proposed drawing correction, corrected drawings, or amendment to the specification to add the reference sign(s) in the description, are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

6. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

7. Claims 1-4, 7-13 and 14-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Burkett et al. ("Berkett", US 6,476,818 B1).

As per claim 1, Burkett teaches a method for processing a directional property in a display object the method comprising:

obtaining an object hierarchy having a root element and one or more child elements, wherein the object hierarchy defines a logical relationship between each object hierarchy element (col. 4, lines 14-16);

associating a directional property for the object hierarchy (col. 5, line 64 through col. 6, line 2);

generating a set of physical coordinates corresponding to a display screen for each element in the object hierarchy, wherein the physical coordinates correspond to the logical relationship between the object hierarchy elements (col. 6, lines 26-30).

As per claims 2-4, Burkett teaches a method for processing a directional property in a display object the method wherein the logical relationship between each display object is a grid layout, a flow layout or an extensible layout (col. 6, lines 8-30).

Art Unit: 2174

As per claims 7-10, Burkett teaches a method for processing a directional property in a display object the method comprises associating a directional property for the object hierarchy includes obtaining a directional property from the root element and associating the directional property for each child element and rendering each display object according to the physical coordinates wherein at least one display object includes one or more layout properties, wherein rendering each display object includes rendering layout properties of display objects and wherein rendering the layout properties of display object including rendering the layout properties according the directional property of the object hierarchy (col. 4, lines 14-16; col. 5, line 64 through col. 6, line 2; col. 6, lines 26-30; col. 10, lines 16-64).

As per claim 11, Burkett teaches a method for processing a directional property in a display object the method wherein some display objects cannot be rendered in at least one directional property (col. 6, line 9-23), the method further comprising maintaining a truth table indicating whether a display object can be rendered in a direction (col. 6, line 60 through col. 8, line 10; col. 8, line 22-39).

Claims 12 and 13 are individually similar in scope to claim 1 and are therefore rejected under similar rationale.

As per claims 14 and 15, Burkett teaches a computer-readable medium having computer-executable components for processing a directional property comprising a layout component for accepting an object hierarchy having a root element and one or more child elements defined according to a logical relationship, the layout component operable to generate a set of physical coordinates for the object hierarchy corresponding to the logical relationship and a directional property for the object hierarchy and further comprising a rendering component operable to

Art Unit: 2174

render object hierarchy according to the physical coordinates and operable to render one or more layout properties of the object hierarchy according to the directional property of the object hierarchy (col. 4, lines 14-16; col. 5, line 64 through col. 6, line 2; col. 6, lines 26-30).

As per claim 16 and 17, Burkett teaches a computer-readable medium having computer-executable components for processing a directional property wherein the rendering component includes rendering information to determine whether one or more display objects may be rendered in a specific direction (col. 6, line 9-23) and wherein the rendering information is maintained in a truth table (col. 6, line 60 through col. 8, line 10; col. 8, line 22-39).

As per claim 18, Burkett teaches a method for processing a direction property in a display object, the method comprising obtaining a display object including a graphical resource wherein the display object includes rendering information to determine whether the graphical resource can be maintained in a specific direction and obtaining a specified directional property specified for the display object, determining whether the display object can be rendered according to the specified directional property (col. 6, line 60 through col. 8, line 10; col. 8, line 22-39; col. 8, line 53 through col. 9, line 8).

As per claims 19 and 20, Burkett teaches a method for processing a direction property in a display object, the method wherein the rendering information includes an original direction of the graphical resource and an indication of whether the graphical resource may be rendered in a different direction and wherein determining whether the display object can be rendered according to the specified directional property includes a comparison of the indication of whether the graphical resource may be rendered in a different direction if the original direction

Art Unit: 2174

of the graphical resource and the specified directional property are not equal (col. 6, line 60 through col. 8, line 10; col. 8, line 53 through col. 9, line 8).

As per claim 21, Burkett teaches a method for processing a direction property in a display object, the method wherein the comparison is conducted in a truth table (col. 6, line 60 through col. 8, line 10; col. 8, line 22-39).

Claims 22 and 23 are individually similar in scope to claim 18 and are therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

8. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

9. Claims 5 and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Burkett et al. ("Burkett", US 6,476,818 B1) in view of Edelman et al. ("Edelman", US 6,442,576 B1).

As per claim 5, Burkett teaches a method for processing a directional property in a display object the method comprising a directional property (col. 9, lines 15-32). Burkett does not explicitly disclose the directional property to be a language reading direction. Edelman teaches a method for processing a directional property in a display object the method (col. 7, lines 22-29). Therefore, it would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to include Edelman's teaching of a method for processing a directional property in a display object the method comprising a directional property wherein the directional property is a language

Art Unit: 2174

reading direction to Burkett's method for processing a directional property in a display object the method comprising a directional property in order to provide users with a process for searching and replacing items with embedded or nested elements.

As per claim 6, the modified Burkett teaches a method for processing a directional property in a display object the method comprising a directional property wherein the language reading direction is a left to right language reading direction (Edelman: col. 7, lines 22-29; *the reading direction is processed in a left to right order*).

Conclusion

10. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Arora et al. (US 5,911,145) teach a hierarchical structure editor for Web sites.

Inquires

11. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Lê Nguyen whose telephone number is (703) 305-7601. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday from 5:30 am to 2:00 pm (EST).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kristine Kincaid, can be reached on (703) 308-0640.

The fax numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are as follows:

(703) 746-7238 [After Final Communication]

(703) 746-7239 [Official Communication]

(703) 746-7240 [For status inquiries, Draft Communication]

Art Unit: 2174

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

Lê Nguyen
Patent Examiner
July 27, 2003

Kristine Kincaid
KRISTINE KINCAID
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100